

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

CANON, INC., CANON U.S.A., INC., AND AXIS COMMUNICATIONS AB,
Petitioners,

v.

AVIGILON FORTRESS CORPORATION
Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2019-00311

Patent No. 7,932,923

**PATENT OWNER'S UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR THE PRO HAC VICE
ADMISSION OF MICHAEL W. DE VRIES, ADAM R. ALPER AND
AKSHAY S. DEORAS**

I. RELIEF REQUESTED

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c), Patent Owner Avigilon Fortress Corporation (“Avigilon”) respectfully moves the Patent Trial & Appeal Board (“Board”) for the *pro hac vice* admission of Michael W. De Vries, Adam R. Alper and Akshay S. Deoras in this proceeding.

II. GOVERNING LAW, RULES, AND PRECEDENT

The Board is authorized to recognize counsel *pro hac vice* pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c), which provides that:

The Board may recognize counsel *pro hac vice* during a proceeding upon a showing of good cause, subject to the condition that lead counsel be a registered practitioner and to any other conditions as the Board may impose. For example, where the lead counsel is a registered practitioner, a motion to appear *pro hac vice* by counsel who is not a registered practitioner may be granted upon showing that counsel is an experienced litigating attorney and has an established familiarity with the subject matter at issue in the proceeding.

The Board has stated that a motion for admission *pro hac vice* should include a “statement of facts showing there is good cause for the Board to recognize counsel *pro hac vice* during the proceeding” and “[b]e accompanied by an affidavit or declaration of the individual seeking to appear attesting to the following

- i. Membership in good standing of the Bar of at least one State or the District of Columbia;
- ii. No suspensions or disbarments from practice

before any court or administrative body; iii. No application for admission to practice before any court or administrative body ever denied; iv. No sanctions or contempt citations imposed by any court or administrative body; v. The individual seeking to appear has read and will comply with the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide and the Board's Rules of Practice for Trials set forth in part 42 of 37 C.F.R.; vi. The individual will be subject to the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct set forth in 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.101 et seq. and disciplinary jurisdiction under 37 C.F.R. § 11.19(a); vii. All other proceedings before the Office for which the individual has applied to appear *pro hac vice* in the last three (3) years; and viii. Familiarity with the subject matter at issue in the proceeding.”

Unified Patents, Inc. v. Parallel Iron, LLC, IPR 2013-00639 (MPT) (Paper 7 at 3-4).

III. STATEMENT OF FACTS

Based on the following facts, supported by their declarations, Avigilon requests that Mr. De Vries, Mr. Alper and Mr. Deoras be admitted *pro hac vice* in this proceeding. As an initial matter, Avigilon's lead and first back-up counsel in this matter, Eugene Goryunov (No. 61,579) and Reza Dokhanchy, (Reg. No. 62,795), are both registered practitioners.

A. Mr. De Vries Meets The Requirements For Admission *Pro Hac Vice*

1. Mr. De Vries has more than 17 years of experience as a litigation attorney specializing in patent litigation, representing clients in patent litigation matters in various United States District Courts and before the International Trade Commission.
2. Mr. De Vries is very familiar with U.S. Patent No. 7,932,923, and with the legal subject matter, technical subject matter, and prior art discussed in Petitioner's Request for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 7,932,923 which forms the basis for this proceeding.
3. Mr. De Vries is a member in good standing of the Bar of the State of California. He is admitted to practice before before the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California, the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, the United States District Court for the Central District of California, the United States District Court for the Southern District of California, the United States District Court of Colorado, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit.
4. Mr. De Vries has never been suspended or disbarred from practice before any court or administrative body.

5. Mr. De Vries has never had a court or administrative body deny an application for admission to practice.
6. Mr. De Vries has never been sanctioned or cited for contempt by any court or administrative body.
7. Mr. De Vries has read and will comply with the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide and the Board's Rules of Practice for Trials set forth in part 42 of 37 C.F.R.
8. Mr. De Vries agrees to be subject to the United States Patent and Trademark Office Code of Professional Responsibility set forth in 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.101 et seq. and disciplinary jurisdiction under 37 C.F.R. § 11.19(a).
9. In the past 3 years, Mr. De Vries was admitted *pro hac vice* as counsel before the PTAB in the following actions.
 - *Inter Partes* Reviews IPR2014-01457, IPR2014-01458, IPR2014-01459, IPR2015-01052, IPR2015-01053, and IPR2015-01054 as counsel for Biscotti concerning a Real Time Video Communications System.
 - *Inter Partes* Reviews IPR2015-00999 and IPR2015-01001 as counsel for Cisco Systems, Inc. concerning Admissions Control In A Connectionless Communications Network, and Providing Media Communication Across Firewalls, respectively.
 - *Inter Partes* Reviews IPR2016-01398, IPR2016-01401, and IPR2016-01402 as counsel for Intel Corp. concerning Security Processor With Bus Configuration, Performance Based Packet Ordering In A PCI Express Bus, and Method For Effecting The Controlled Shutdown Of Data Processing Units, respectively.
 - *Inter Partes* Review IPR2016-01434 as counsel for Oracle Corporation concerning an Apparatus For Distributing Content Objects To A

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.